

## **Master Plan Committee Minutes**

Wednesday, September 13, 1:30–2:30 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 312

**Members:** Fred Haberecht, Dave Bradford, Tom Satterly, Blanche Hughes, Doug Max, Lynn Johnson, Tom Milligan, Rick Miranda, Alan Rudolph, Leslie Taylor, Nancy Hurt (by phone)

**Other participants:** Hanna Johnson, Anthony Taylor, Cass Beitler, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Dave Hansen, Julia Innes

### **1. Hughes Stadium Property Redevelopment**

- a. Approximately 160 acres of the Hughes Stadium property will be sold by the university as directed by the Board of Governors.
  - i. Hughes Stadium is not considered a long-term asset and will be demolished.
  - ii. There will be a developer brought on through the RFP process for the redevelopment of Hughes Stadium. There is no development plan to date.
  - iii. There is adequate space at Foothills Campus to realize the mission of the university. The Hughes Stadium site is not considered an asset to carry on the university's mission of teaching, research, and outreach in a direct way.
- b. There are two upcoming meetings: a neighborhood listening session on 9/20 and a public (open to the community) listening session on 10/18.
  - i. These meetings are about the process moving forward and will give a lot of information on site context.
  - ii. Community to give general input and voice concerns.
  - iii. About 450 people said they would attend in response to mailers sent out to the neighborhoods surrounding Hughes.
- c. Pam Jackson has received input from community members from the website—about 20 comments so far.
- d. Tom Milligan says we have signaled that affordable and attainable housing can be a possible option that a development plan can look at.
- e. What is CSU's role in the redevelopment?
  - i. As part of the sell, CSU could have some leverage for affordable housing or some portion of the property could be set aside for another type of entity.
- f. Kristi Buffington asks: If we sell the land, how does it affect water detention and fees?
  - i. There is a long-term city-managed easement facility on the detention pond site, with a requirement for the detention to remain there.
  - ii. It could go in a different configuration, if it's the highest best use, but the detention has to be there.
  - iii. That detention is seen as adequate for the redevelopment on the site.
- g. Hughes Stadium has been decommissioned and locked down. It has always been a non-public area, except for during events, with no trespassing signs. It is not a community park.
- h. Demolition of Hughes: Currently in discussion and investigation of the right approach to demolish the structure; speaking with a consultant on what it takes to demolish Hughes.
  - i. Will be doing demolition, not deconstruction.
  - ii. Will salvage whatever materials we can reuse/of value.
  - iii. Four-month process to begin, before demolition occurs—first surveying and developing a work plan, which should take two months; then will start the abatement process for asbestos, which will take another two months to accomplish.

- iv. Considering if it will be less expensive to put a crushing plant on site—and if that will be allowed by the neighbors and CSU.
  - 1. Who would we ask if we were deciding to do that? The county.
  - 2. CSURF recommends demolition is handled prior to annexation.
  - 3. There is a lot of caution—the Bureau of Reclamation will also be involved.

## 2. Game Day 8/26 & 9/9 - Modal Split

- a. Received feedback from City Council that this process involved a good partnership and was successful.
  - i. Council member Cunniff and council member Overbeck received zero complaints from constituents. Generally, there was positive feedback about the experience.
  - ii. City neighborhood services main issues were just informative (such as cannot have open containers in the neighborhoods). Neighborhood ambassadors answered a lot of questions, many about clear bag policy, open container policy, and RP3.
  - iii. Very little parking on grass for tailgating.
  - iv. Few noise complaints for the first game.
    - 1. City did readings during both game, no noise above ambient noise in neighborhoods.
- b. Few complaints on campus.
- c. It is a more intensive effort than at Hughes stadium.
  - i. More police, more Landmark staff, and more Facilities staff working the game. That resulted in most things going well.
  - ii. Emergency services responded to 100 calls on the first game, mostly related to dehydration (heat and alcohol consumption), which is more than usual for Hughes. However, the second game was more aligned to what we've seen at Hughes.
- d. Didn't see the vehicle congestion that we expected on Shields—it was manageable.
- e. Significant Uber and Lyft usage.
  - i. Resulting in a need to give Uber and Lyft greater access to campus, so we opened Pitkin Street with a drop off at Newton's Court.
  - ii. Uber and Lyft passengers dropped off in the neighborhood of Whitcomb and Prospect.
    - 1. There's only so much we can do to discourage this behavior.
    - 2. We provided a close space at Pitkin at Newton's Corner.
    - 3. Possibly open up Lake and Whitcomb area for this as well.
- f. People got out quicker into free moving traffic after a game.
  - i. Our goal was to have this occur within 90 minutes after the game, but we exceeded that goal and it happened within 55 minutes during first game.
- g. Significant bike and pedestrian traffic and transit heavily used. After a season we will know better on driving, biking, pedestrian patterns.
  - i. We saw buses overloaded four hours before game time. People came early and experienced campus before the games.
  - ii. A lot of pedestrians coming from off campus.
  - iii. Pedestrian buttons were deactivated and there was signage for game days telling people to use the underpass, but still saw some pedestrians not using the grade separated crossing.
- h. Less people drove than we expected and very little use of cash lots.
  - i. Prices are going down on cash lots because demand wasn't there.
  - ii. 3.5 people per car was higher than expected.

- i. Over 7,500 people took MAX alone, coming to campus; these were people not necessarily coming to the game, but just to be on campus.
  - i. 5,600 came to game, but roughly 2,000 came to campus. Assumption is that people came to experience campus and what was going on.
  - ii. These numbers are above regular ridership, and just reflect Prospect and University stations.
  - iii. Riders may have to wait a couple of cycles to get on MAX.
  - iv. Saw underutilized transit from the north/old town area (and underutilized the parking garages) with the vast majority of people getting on from the south stations.
- j. **Action Item (Fred):** Find out if the City is monitoring the economic impact of game day. The MPC would like to see that data.
- k. Towing
  - i. There were 61 cars towed from city streets during the first game, and the amount for the second game was significantly reduced.
  - ii. 49 cars on campus towed during first game; 57 on the second game.
  - iii. Comment expressed that it would be good to know how many repeats.
- l. Question asking about people trying to access campus for work on game days—any concerns?
  - i. None that Doug Max knows of, but he says that Athletics can help facilitate this if they know ahead of time.
- m. Campus trash cans deployed widely on first game, but found most activity occurred by the stadium.
  - i. Fans were very respectful of campus in general.
- n. Need to work on getting students engaged with going to the game.
- o. ASCSU representatives share their experiences of game day feedback.
  - i. There were issues with contamination for compost collecting during the first game, but it went better on the second game.
  - ii. A lot of people had questions about where the water facilities were. Maybe labeling that better would be helpful.
  - iii. Make clear that parking for repair in the South College Garage is free. There was some confusion during the first game.
- p. Concern expressed by Rick Miranda for UCA employees not being able to park at the South College Parking Garage when they can see it isn't being utilized and there isn't close parking near them.
  - i. Dave Bradford explains that there are concerns about being inconsistent with this space, and concerns for employees being confused about when they have to pay for it and when they don't.
  - ii. Could solve the problem by allowing UCA employees to park in the UCA lot. Once the game has started, if there is availability in the lot, then the group thinks why not allow them to park there. Because predicting how much parking is needed, it can't be allowed before game day, but maybe the restrictions on parking could be released after a certain time. It will be a matter of someone monitoring, so employees know when and how.

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, October 11, 1:30–2:30 p.m., Lory Student Center, Room 322**